UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/736,117	12/15/2003	Lennart J. Brandel	7343-1	3626
JOHNS MANV	7590 01/28/200 'ILLE	EXAMINER		
Legal Department			CHOI, PETER Y	
10100 West Ute Avenue Littleton, CO 80127			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1794	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			01/28/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/736,117	BRANDEL ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	PETER Y. CHOI	1794
The MAILING DATE of this communication a Period for Reply	ppears on the cover sheet with	the correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REF WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perions are reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by state Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the main earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICA 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply od will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTH ute, cause the application to become ABAN	TION. / be timely filed S from the mailing date of this communication. DONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☐ The 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allow closed in accordance with the practice under	nis action is non-final. vance except for formal matters	•
Disposition of Claims		
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1,3,4,6,7,11-15,19 and 21 is/are pe 4a) Of the above claim(s) 12-15,19 and 21 is 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1,3,4,6,7 and 11 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	/are withdrawn from considera	tion.
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Exami	ner.	
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) and an applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction. 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the	ccepted or b) objected to by ne drawing(s) be held in abeyance ection is required if the drawing(s)	. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docume 2. Certified copies of the priority docume 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority docume application from the International Bure * See the attached detailed Office action for a li	ents have been received. ents have been received in Appriority documents have been re eau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	lication No ceived in this National Stage
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(s)/N	nmary (PTO-413) fail Date mal Patent Application

Application/Control Number: 10/736,117 Page 2

Art Unit: 1794

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Applicants' submissions of December 17, 2007, are noted. Claim 21 is dependent from method claim 12, which was withdrawn in the Non-Final Rejection of August 30, 2005, section 4, and affirmed in Applicants' submissions of November 28, 2005, as an election made without traverse. Since claim 21 is dependent from a non-elected invention, the claim is withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over EP 1162306 to Draxö in view of USPN 5,433,997 to Land.

Regarding claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, and 11, Draxö teaches a woven, patterned glass fiber textile fabric comprised of a glass fiber yarn with a titer of from about 30 to 75 tex as the warp, and a glass fiber yarn having a titer ranging from 190 to 350 tex as the weft, wherein the warp density ranges from 2.5 to 5 threads/cm and the weft density ranges from 2.0 to 12 threads/cm, wherein each glass fiber yarn used as the warp and/or weft is a sliver or a texturized yarn (see entire document including paragraphs 0001-0022, 0031-0033, 0039).

Application/Control Number: 10/736,117

Art Unit: 1794

Regarding claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, and 11, Draxö does not appear to teach that the woven, patterned glass fiber textile fabric is formed from a Jacquard weaving process using a Jacquard loom. Since Draxö is silent as to the specific weaving process, it would have been necessary and therefore obvious to look to the prior art for conventional weaving processes. Land provides this conventional teaching, showing that it was known in the wallcovering art to form a fabric for use in wallcovering comprising textured glass woven yarns, wherein the fabric is woven into various styles including Jacquard, and woven using known looms (Land, column 1 line 7 to column 4 line 36, column 5 line 34 to column 6 line 2). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the wallcovering art at the time the invention was made to form the woven glass fiber textile fabric of Draxö, wherein the fabric is formed from the process as taught by Land, motivated by the desire of forming a conventional wallcovering with a style known in the wallcovering art to be predictably suitable for use in wallcovering, based on the desired physical properties of the fabric including style, appearance, hand, and loft. Additionally, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the wallcovering art at the time the invention was made to form the woven glass fiber textile fabric of Draxö, wherein each glass fiber yarn is texturized, as taught by Land, motivated by the desire of forming a conventional wallcovering with improvements known in the wallcovering art to be predictably suitable for use in wallcovering, such that the yarn is texturized or bulked to provide improved yarn coverage and other desirable properties such as improved hand and loft.

Page 3

Regarding claims 3 and 4, the prior art teaches that the titer of the warp yarn is about 34 tex or about 70 tex (Draxö, paragraph 0017).

Regarding claims 6 and 7, the prior art teaches that the titer of the weft yarn is about 200 tex or about 330 tex (Draxö, paragraph 0018).

Additionally, the warp and weft densities and the titer of the glass fiber yarn in the warp and the titer of the glass fiber yarn in the weft are obvious because it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention as made to vary the warp and weft densities and warp and weft titer to within the claimed ranges, as it naturally flows from the teachings of the prior art and it is understood by one of ordinary skill in the art that the densities and titer determine various physical properties of the fabric including the strength, density, porosity, and appearance of the fabric, and because it has been held that discovering an optimum value of a result effective variable involves only routine skill in the art.

Regarding claim 11, the prior art teaches that the textile is impregnated with a chemical formulation comprised of a starch binder and a polymeric binder (Draxö, paragraphs 00001-0022, 0031-0033, 0039).

Response to Arguments

4. Applicants' arguments with respect to claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, and 11 have been considered but are most in view of the new grounds of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to PETER Y. CHOI whose telephone number is (571)272-6730. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 08:00 - 15:00.

Application/Control Number: 10/736,117 Page 5

Art Unit: 1794

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Larry Tarazano can be reached on (571) 272-1515. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Peter Y Choi /PYC/ Examiner, Art Unit 1794

/Andrew T Piziali/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1794